

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 52 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 16, 19 to 29, 32 to 44 and 46 to 52 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 30, 31, and 45 stand rejected as obvious.

Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 16, 19 to 29, 32 to 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,507,867, hereinafter referred to as "Holland"

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. With respect to the second element of Claim 1, the rejection quoted the element and then stated:

(Holland, col. 14, 1.35-38, and fig. 7 shows the rendered data has been transmitted to the client).

This reduces the claim language to a gist and ignores explicit claim limitations. Claim 1 does not simply recite that "the rendered data has been transmitted to the client," but rather,

a processing server . . . for receiving the rendering determination from the proxy server, rendering the requested data, and transmitting the rendered data to the client.

Thus, Claim 1 recites that the processing server renders the requested data and transmits the rendered data to the client. The client is defined in Claim 1 as being different from the proxy server and the processing server. The server in Fig. 7 of Holland transmits a bundle to the proxy server and not the client. Therefore, Holland not only fails to anticipate Claim 1, but teaches away. Moreover, the rejection has failed to cite any teaching of rendering data by the server of Holland. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 5, 8 and 9 depend from Claim 1. Therefore, each of Claims 2 to 5, 8 and 9 distinguishes over Holland for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2 to 5, 8 and 9.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claims 10 to 16, and 19 to 22. The Office Action stated that these claims have similar limitations to Claims 1 to 5, 8 and 9 are rejected for the same reasons.

As noted above with respect to Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, the reference teaches away from the processing server of the present invention as noted with respect to Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference. Claim 10 includes a limitation similar to Claim 1 and so distinguishes over Holland for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 10.

Claims 11 to 16 and 19 to 22 depend from Claim 10. Therefore, each of Claims 11 to 16 and 19 to 22 distinguishes over Holland for at least the same reasons as Claim 10. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 11 to 16 and 19 to 22.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 23. With respect to Claim 23, the Office Action stated that Claims 23 to 29 and 32 to 34 have similar limitations as Claims 1 to 8 and are rejected for the same reasons.

As noted above with respect to Claim 1 and herein incorporated by reference, the cited portions of Holland failed to teach or suggest the operations performed by a **proxy server** and a **processing server**, as recited in Claim 23. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 23.

Claims 24 to 29 and 32 to 34 depend from Claim 23. Therefore, each of Claims 24 to 29 and 32 to 34 distinguishes over Holland for at least the same reasons as Claim 23. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 24 to 29 and 32 to 34.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 35. With respect to Claim 35, the Office Action stated that Claims 35 to 38 have a similar limitation as Claims 1 to 4 and 8 and were therefore rejected for the same reasons.

As noted above with respect to Claim 1 and herein incorporated by reference, Holland failed to teach or suggest the operation performed by the processing server as recited in Claim 35. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 35.

Claims 36 to 38 depend from Claim 35. Therefore, each of Claims 36 to 38 distinguishes over Holland for at least the same reasons as Claim 35. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 36 to 38.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 39. Claim 39 stated in part:

...rendering the data at a processing server; and transmitting, by the processing server, the rendered data to the client.

As heretofore noted with respect to Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Holland failed to teach or suggest **transmitting by the processing server the rendered data to the client**. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 39.

With respect to Claim 40, as noted with respect to Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Holland shows that the

proxy server controls communications with the client. In contrast, in Claim 40, the proxy server authorizes the processing server to retrieve and render the data and to transmit the rendered data to the client. Since in Holland, the proxy server transmits all data to the client, Whitledge teaches away from the proxy server of Claim 40.

Claims 41 to 44 and 46 to 52 depend from Claim 40. Therefore, each of Claims 41 to 44 and 46 to 52 distinguishes over Holland for at least the same reasons as Claim 40. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 41 to 44 and 46 to 52.


Claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 30, 31 and 45 are rejected as obvious over the combination of Holland in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595. Assuming the combination of the references is correct, the additional information cited in the second reference does not cure the defects of the primary reference as noted with respect to the independent claim from which each of these claims depend. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 30, 31 and 45.

Claims 1 to 52 remain in the application. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 17, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880



Attorney for Applicant(s)

July 17, 2007
Date of Signature